

DOCKET FILE COPY ORIGINAL

From: John Brueck <jbrueck@svpal.org>
To: A16.A16(RM-8653,RM-8648)
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: Spectrum allocation

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

472-1 N. Winchester Blvd
Santa Clara, CA 95050
18 July 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

FCC Commissioners:

I believe that there should be a public wireless spectrum through which citizens are permitted to confer locally without the intercession of a wired phone company. Please support more public access to the airwaves. Thanks
John Brueck

No. of Copies rec'd
DATE

2

From: John Brueck <jbrueck@svpa.org>
To: A16.A16(RM-8653, RM-8648)
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: Spectrum allocation

472-1 N. Winchester Blvd
Santa Clara, CA 95050
18 July 1995

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

FCC Commissioners:

I believe that there should be a public wireless spectrum through which citizens are permitted to confer locally without the intercession of a wired phone company. Please support more public access to the airwaves. Thanks
John Brueck

No. of Copies rec'd 2
DATE

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

From: Mark Bixby <markb@spock.dis.cccd.edu>
To: A16.A16(RM-8648)
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: WINForum petition

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

I oppose the RM-8648 WINForum petition on the grounds that it is not the best possible use of the spectrum.

-- Mark Bixby E-mail: markb@cccd.edu
Coast Community College Dist. Web: <http://www.cccd.edu/~markb/>
District Information Services 1370 Adams Ave., Costa Mesa, CA, USA 92626-5429
Technical Support +1 714 432-5865 x7064
"You can tune a file system, but you can't tune a fish." - tunefs(1M)

File of Originals
DATE

2

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

From: Mark Bixby <markb@spock.dis.cccd.edu>
To: A16.A16(RM-8848)
Date: 7/19/95 5:22pm
Subject: WINForum petition

**FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY**

I oppose the RM-8848 WINForum petition on the grounds that it is not the best possible use of the spectrum.

-- Mark Bixby E-mail: markb@cccd.edu
Coast Community College Dist. Web: <http://www.cccd.edu/~markb/>
District Information Services 1370 Adams Ave., Costa Mesa, CA, USA 92626-5429
Technical Support +1 714 432-5885 x7084
"You can tune a file system, but you can't tune a fish." - tuneys(1M)

From: David Goodbary <david@dadent.wustl.edu>
To: A16.A16(RM-8648)
Date: [REDACTED]
Subject: Please Support RM-8648

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

Inventor of Packet Networking (and much more!) Notes Some Values of Pub-Spectrum

[Paul Baran is an internationally-renown, elder statesman of computer communications. He has been a frontiersman and innovator in datacomm since at least the 1960s - and "continues" to innovate ... when permitted by law.
--jim]

Date: 11 Jul 95 21:56:23 EDT
From: Paul Baran <73507.2223@compuserve.com>

This is written in response to [a request from] Jim Warren for reasons that the FCC Commissioners or others should want to learn more about the Apple NII Communications Commons proposal:

1. The Apple NII proposal raises the opportunity to consider a major new concept: how new technology can allow many more users to share the common radio spectrum at lower cost and regulatory burden.
2. This is a wake up call from the technical community to the FCC to draw attention to the implications of the new digital signal processing communications technology.
3. With success the amount of available spectrum space could be greatly increased to improve our ability to apply electronic communications to societal sectors not cost effective today, nor likely to be feasible with the present regulatory trajectory.
4. Public shared access by all comers without complex licensing is both technically and economically superior to the present concept of auctioning off the public spectrum to the highest bidder.
5. While the funds received from the one time auction appear to be significant, they are economically counterproductive. The high front end costs of spectrum licensing is a major disincentive to new technology risk investments in new radio technology. (Initial venture capital investments can rarely be justified if greater than a few million dollars, an amount far less than the bid price of national frequencies.) Only very large companies seeking monopoly positions can afford the front end costs of the bidding game.
6. The one time funds received by government for selling off the public's spectrum is small compared to the long term revenue potential over time. It is a public policy of selling the goose that lays the golden eggs rather than the eggs over time.
7. To ignore this new input information means continuing to keep a range of new services from becoming cost feasible.
8. We believe the new technology alternatives are so compelling that it will be just a matter of time whether it is adopted or not. When the new technology is adopted, either earlier or later, the world will look back and credit the FCC Commissioners for their vision, or view them in retrospect with the same attitude as we view the old East Germany leadership for trying to maintain the status quo.

RECEIVED
JUL 19 1995

2

RECEIVED

JUL 19 1995

FEDERAL COMMUNICATIONS COMMISSION
OFFICE OF SECRETARY

From: David Goodbary <david@dadent.wustl.edu>
To: A16.A16(RM-8648)
Date: 7/18/95 8:30pm
Subject: Please Support RM-8648

Inventor of Packet Networking (and much more!) Notes Some Values of Pub-Spectrum

[Paul Baran is an internationally-renown, elder statesman of computer communications. He has been a frontiersman and innovator in datacomm since at least the 1960s - and "continues" to innovate ... when permitted by law.
-jim]

Date: 11 Jul 95 21:58:23 EDT
From: Paul Baran <73607.2223@compuserve.com>

This is written in response to [a request from] Jim Warren for reasons that the FCC Commissioners or others should want to learn more about the Apple NII Communications Commons proposal:

1. The Apple NII proposal raises the opportunity to consider a major new concept: how new technology can allow many more users to share the common radio spectrum at lower cost and regulatory burden.
2. This is a wake up call from the technical community to the FCC to draw attention to the implications of the new digital signal processing communications technology.
3. With success the amount of available spectrum space could be greatly increased to improve our ability to apply electronic communications to societal sectors not cost effective today, nor likely to be feasible with the present regulatory trajectory.
4. Public shared access by all comers without complex licensing is both technically and economically superior to the present concept of auctioning off the public spectrum to the highest bidder.
5. While the funds received from the one time auction appear to be significant, they are economically counterproductive. The high front end costs of spectrum licensing is a major disincentive to new technology risk investments in new radio technology. (Initial venture capital investments can rarely be justified if greater than a few million dollars, an amount far less than the bid price of national frequencies.) Only very large companies seeking monopoly positions can afford the front end costs of the bidding game.
6. The one time funds received by government for selling off the public's spectrum is small compared to the long term revenue potential over time. It is a public policy of selling the goose that lays the golden eggs rather than the eggs over time.
7. To ignore this new input information means continuing to keep a range of new services from becoming cost feasible.
8. We believe the new technology alternatives are so compelling that it will be just a matter of time whether it is adopted or not. When the new technology is adopted, either earlier or later, the world will look back and credit the FCC Commissioners for their vision, or view them in retrospect with the same attitude as we view the old East Germany leadership for trying to maintain the status quo.